arXiv:1702.04949v1 [math.RA] 16 Feb 2017

NONCOMMUTATIVE FRAMES

KARIN CVETKO-VAH

Abstract. We explore algebraic properties of noncommutative frames. The concept of noncommutative frames is due to Le Bruyn, who introduced it in connection with noncommutative covers of the Connes-Consani arithmetic site.

1. Introduction

The motivation for our definition of a noncommutative frame comes from the following interesting example of noncommutative covers on the arithmetic site that is due to Le Bruyn [8]. We refer the reader to [3] and [4] for the definitions of an arithmetic site, and to [7] for the definition of the sieve topology on the arithmetic site.

Example 1.1 ([8])**.** The sieve topology on the arithmetic site is defined by the basic open sets that correspond to sieves $S \in \mathbf{\Omega}$ and are denoted by $\mathbb{X}_s(S)$, where $\mathbf{\Omega}$ is the subobject-classifier of the arithmetic site topos $\hat{C}$. The sheaf $\mathcal{O}^c$ of constructible truth fluctuations has as sections over the open set $\mathbb{X}_s(S)$ for $S \in \omega$ the set of all continuous functions x from $\mathbb{X}_s(S)$ (with the induced patch topology) to the Boolean semifield $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$ (with the discrete topology).

A noncommutative frame $\mathbf{\Theta}$, which represents the set of opens of a noncommutative topology, is defined as the set of all pairs (S, x), where $S \in \mathbf{\Omega}$ and $x : \mathbb{X}_s(S) \to \mathbb{B}$ continuous. The noncommutative frame operations are defined on $\mathbf{\Theta}$ by:

$$\begin{aligned}(S, x) \wedge (T, y) &= (S \wedge T, x|_{\mathbb{X}_s(S)\cap\mathbb{X}_s(T)})\\ (S, x) \vee (T, y) &= (S \vee T, y|_{\mathbb{X}_s(T)} \cup x|_{\mathbb{X}_s(S)-\mathbb{X}_s(T)})\\ (S, x) \to (T, y) &= (S \to T, y \cup 1_{\mathbb{X}_s(S\to T)-X_s(T)}).\end{aligned}$$

In Section 3 we define noncommutative Heyting algebras and explore their algebraic properties. In Section 4 we define noncommutative frames that generalize the usual notion of a frame, and show that noncommutative frames are precisely join complete noncommutative Heyting algebras.

2. Preliminaries

A *skew lattice* is an algebra $(S; \wedge, \vee)$ where $\wedge$ and $\vee$ are idempotent and associative binary operations that satisfy the absorption laws $x \wedge (x \vee y) =$

$x = x \vee (x \wedge y)$ and $(x \wedge y) \vee y = y = (x \vee y) \wedge y$. Given a skew lattice S and $x, y \in S$ the following equivalences hold:

$$x \wedge y = x \Leftrightarrow x \vee y = y \qquad \text{and} \qquad x \wedge y = y \Leftrightarrow x \vee y = x.$$

A skew lattice is a lattice when both operations $\wedge$, $\vee$ are commutative. In general, $\wedge$ is commutative if and only if $\vee$ is such.

The *natural partial order* is defined on a skew lattice S by $x \leq y$ iff $x \wedge y = x = y \wedge x$, or equivalently $x \vee y = y = y \vee x$; and the *natural preorder* is defined by $x \preceq y$ iff $x \wedge y \wedge x = x$, or equivalently $y \vee x \vee y = y$. The natural preorder induces Green's equivalence relation $\mathcal{D}$ defined by $x \mathcal{D} y$ iff $x \preceq y$ and $y \preceq x$. Leech's first decomposition theorem for skew lattices [9] yields that $\mathcal{D}$ is a congruence on a skew lattice S, each congruence class is a rectangular subalgebra (characterized by $x \wedge y = y \vee x$) and $S/\mathcal{D}$ is a maximal lattice image of S. We denote the $\mathcal{D}$-class containing x by $\mathcal{D}_x$.

A skew lattice is *strongly distributive* if it satisfies the identities:

$$(x \vee y) \wedge z = (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z) \text{ and } x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z).$$

Strongly distributive skew lattices are *distributive* [9, 10], ie. they satisfy the identities:

$$x \wedge (y \vee z) \wedge x = (x \wedge y \wedge x) \vee (x \wedge z \wedge x), \tag{1}$$

$$x \vee (y \wedge z) \vee x = (x \vee y \vee x) \wedge (x \vee z \vee x). \tag{2}$$

A skew lattice S is *symmetric* if given any $x, y \in S$, $x \wedge y = y \wedge x$ iff $x \vee y = y \vee x$. If S is a symmetric skew lattice then we say that elements x and y in S *commute* if $x \wedge y = y \wedge x$ (and hence also $x \vee y = y \vee x$); a subset $A \subseteq S$ is a *commuting subset* if x and y commute for all $x, y \in A$. By a result of [2] a skew lattice is strongly distributive if and only if it is symmetric and normal and $S/\mathcal{D}$ is a distributive lattice. Here a skew lattice is called *normal* provided that it satisfies the identity $x \wedge y \wedge z \wedge x = x \wedge z \wedge y \wedge x$. By a result of Leech [11] a skew lattice is normal if and only if $u{\downarrow} = \{x \in S \mid x \leq u\}$ is a lattice for all $u \in S$.

A *lattice section* L of a skew lattice S is a sub-algebra that is a lattice (ie. both $\wedge$ and $\vee$ are commutative on L) which intersects each $\mathcal{D}$-class in exactly one element. A lattice section (when it exists) of a skew lattice is a maximal commuting subset isomorphic to its maximal lattice image by a result of [9]. If a normal skew lattice S has a top $\mathcal{D}$-class T then given $t \in T$, $t{\downarrow} = \{x \in S \mid x \leq t\}$ is a lattice section of S. A skew lattice has a bottom element 0 if $x \vee 0 = x = x \vee 0$, or equivalently $x \wedge 0 = 0 = 0 \wedge x$) holds for all $x \in S$.

A connection between strongly distributive skew lattices and sheaves over distributive skew lattices was established in [1], where it was shown that the category of left-handed (ie. satisfying $x \wedge y \wedge x = x \wedge y$, or equivalently $x \vee y \vee x = y \vee x$) strongly distributive skew lattice with 0 is dual to sheaves over locally compact Priestley spaces with suitable morphisms. Via this duality the elements of the skew lattice S are represented as sections over

compact and open subsets of the Priestley space of the distributive lattice $S/\mathcal{D}$. Given two such sections s and r the skew lattice operations are defined by:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \textit{Restriction:} & s \wedge r = s|_{\mathrm{dom}s \cap \mathrm{dom}r}. \\ \textit{Override:} & s \vee r = r \cup s|_{\mathrm{dom}s \setminus \mathrm{dom}r}. \end{array}$$

We refer the reader to [13] and [14] for the definition and further details regarding the Priestley space of a distributive lattice.

A *Heyting algebra* is an algebra $(H; \wedge, \vee, \to, 1, 0)$ such that $(H, \wedge, \vee, 1, 0)$ is a bounded distributive lattice that satisfies the following set of axioms:

(H1) $(x \to x) = 1$,
(H2) $x \wedge (x \to y) = x \wedge y$,
(H3) $y \wedge (x \to y) = y$,
(H4) $x \to (y \wedge z) = (x \to y) \wedge (x \to z)$.

Equivalently, the axioms (H1)–(H4) can be replaced by the following single axiom:

(HA) $x \wedge y \leq z$ iff $x \leq y \to z$.

A *frame* is a lattice that has all finite meets and all joins (finite and infinite), and satisfies the infinite distributive law:

$$x \wedge \bigvee_i y_i = \bigvee_i (x \wedge y_i).$$

Frames are exactly complete Heyting algebras, see [12] for details.

3. Noncommutative Heyting algebras

If a strongly distributive skew lattice contains a top element 1 (satisfying $1 \wedge x = x = x \wedge 1$ and $1 \vee x = 1 = x \vee 1$) then it is commutative. Hence one needs to sacrifice the top element when passing to the noncommutative setting. (Alternatively, one could deal with order-duals of strongly distributive skew lattices and keep 1 but sacrifice 0. The latter approach is reasonable when logic is considered, and was carried out in [5].)

A *noncommutative Heyting algebra* is an algebra $(S; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t)$ where $(S; \wedge, \vee, 0)$ is a strongly distributive skew lattice with bottom 0 and a top $\mathcal{D}$-class T, t is a distinguished element of T and $\to$ is a binary operation that satisfies the following axioms:

(NH1) $x \to y = (y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y) \to y$,
(NH2) $x \to x = x \vee t \vee x$,
(NH3) $x \wedge (x \to y) \wedge x = x \wedge y \wedge x$,
(NH4) $y \wedge (x \to y) = y$ and $(x \to y) \wedge y = y$,
(NH5) $x \to (t \wedge (y \wedge z) \wedge t) = (x \to (t \wedge y \wedge t)) \wedge (x \to (t \wedge z \wedge t))$.

Note that the axiom (NH4) yields $y \leq x \to y$ for all $x, y \in S$. Noncommutative Heyting algebras form a variety because the fact that the distinguished element t lies in the top $\mathcal{D}$-class is characterized by $x \wedge t \wedge x = x$ (or equivalentely, $t \vee x \vee t = t$).

Example 3.1. Let $\mathcal{P}(A, \{0,1\}$ be the set of all partial functions from A to $\{0,1\}$ where A is a non-empty set. Leech [11] defined skew lattice operations on $\mathcal{P}(A, \{0,1\})$ by:

$$f \wedge g = f|_{\mathrm{dom} f \cap \mathrm{dom} g}$$
$$f \vee g = g \cup f|_{\mathrm{dom} f - \mathrm{dom} g}$$

Leech proved that $(\mathcal{P}(A, \{0,1\}; \wedge, \vee)$ is a left-handed, strongly distributive skew lattice with bottom $\emptyset$, with the maximal lattice image $\mathcal{P}(A,B)/\mathcal{D}$ being isomorphic to the power set of A.The top $\mathcal{D}$-class of $\mathcal{P}(A,B)$ consists of all total functions. Denote by τ the total function defined by $\tau(x) = 1$ for all $x \in A$. Following Le Bruyn's Example 1.1 we define the operation $\to$ on $\mathcal{P}(A, \{0,1\})$ by:

$$f \to g = g \cup \tau|_{A - (\mathrm{dom} f \cup \mathrm{dom} g)}.$$

We claim that $(\mathcal{P}(A, \{0,1\}; \wedge, \vee, \to, \emptyset, \tau)$ is a noncommutative Heyting algebra.
(NH1): $f \to g = (g \vee (\tau \wedge f \wedge \tau) \vee g) \to g$ because both sides of the equality reduce to $g \cup \tau|_{A-(\mathrm{dom} f \cup \mathrm{dom} g)}$.
(NH2): $f \to f = f \vee \tau \vee f$ because both sides of the equality reduce to $f \cup \tau|_{A - \mathrm{dom} f}$.
(NH3): $f \wedge (f \to g) \wedge f = f \wedge g \wedge f$ because both sides of the equality reduce to $f|_{\mathrm{dom} f \cap \mathrm{dom} g}$.
(NH4): Both $g \wedge (f \to g)$ and $(f \to g) \wedge g$ reduce to g.
(NH5): $f \to (\tau \wedge g \wedge h \wedge \tau) = (f \to (\tau \wedge g \wedge \tau)) \wedge (f \to (\tau \wedge h \wedge \tau))$ because both sides of the equality reduce to $\tau|_{(A - \mathrm{dom} f) \cup (\mathrm{dom} g \cap \mathrm{dom} h)}$.

The following is an easy but useful consequence of the fact that all skew lattices are regular in that they satisfy $x \wedge y \wedge x \wedge z \wedge x = x \wedge y \wedge z \wedge x$ and $x \vee y \vee x \vee z \vee x = x \vee y \vee z \vee x$.

Lemma 3.2 ([6])**.** *Let S be a skew lattice and $x, y, u, v \in S$ s.t. $u \preceq x, y \preceq v$ holds. Then:*

(i) $x \wedge v \wedge y = x \wedge y$,
(ii) $x \vee u \vee y = x \vee y$.

We will make use of the following technical lemmas in the proof of Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $(S; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t)$ be a noncommutative Heyting algebra and let $x \in S$, $y, z \in t{\downarrow}$. Then:*

(i) $x \to t = t$,
(ii) $y \to z \in t{\downarrow}$.

Therefore the lattice $t{\downarrow}$ is closed under $\to$.

Proof. (i) Using (NH1) we obtain: $x \to t = (t \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee t) \to t = t \to t = t$ by (NH2).

(ii) Since $z \leq t$ we obtain: $y \to z = y \to (t \wedge (z \wedge t) \wedge t)$. This is further equal to $y \to (t \wedge z \wedge t)) \wedge (y \to (t \wedge t \wedge t)$ by (NH5), which equals $(y \to z) \wedge (y \to t) = (y \to z) \wedge t$. Similarly, we prove $t \wedge (y \to z) = y \to z$ and $y \to z \leq t$ follows. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $(S; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t)$ be a noncommutative Heyting algebra and $x, y \in S$. Then y, $y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y$ and $x \to y$ all lie in the lattice $(y \vee t \vee y)\downarrow$.*

Proof. Denote $t' = y \vee t \vee y$. The absorption yields $y \vee (y \vee t \vee y) = y \vee t \vee y$ and likewise $(y \vee x \vee y) \vee y = y$. Hence $y \leq y \vee t \vee y$ and thus $y \in t'\downarrow$.

Similarly, $(x \to y) \vee (y \vee t \vee y) = ((x \to y) \vee y) \vee t \vee y = y \vee t \vee y$ since $y \leq (x \to y)$ by axiom (NH4). Together with $(y \vee t \vee y) \vee (x \to y) = y \vee t \vee y$ this yields $x \to y \leq t'$.

It remains to prove that $y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y \leq t'$. Using Lemma 3.2: $(y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y) \vee t' = y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y \vee y \vee t \vee y = y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee t \vee y$. By absorption this equals $y \vee t \vee y = t'$. Likewise we prove that $t' \vee (y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y) = t'$ and $y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y \leq t'$ follows. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let $(S; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t)$ be a noncommutative Heyting algebra. Then:*

(i) *$(t\downarrow; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t)$ is a Heyting algebra.*

(ii) *Given any $t' \in \mathcal{D}_t$, $(t'\downarrow; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t')$ is a Heyting algebra, the map*

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \varphi : t\downarrow & \to & t'\downarrow \\ x & \mapsto & t' \wedge x \wedge t' \end{array}$$

is an isomorphism of Heyting algebras and $x \,\mathcal{D}\, \varphi(x)$ holds for all $x \in t\downarrow$.

(iii) *Green's relation $\mathcal{D}$ is a congruence on S and the maximal lattice image $S/\mathcal{D}$ is a Heyting algebra isomorphic to $t\downarrow$.*

Proof. (i) By a result of [11] $t\downarrow$ is a bounded distributive lattice, and by Lemma 3.3 it is closed under $\to$. Since all elements of $t\downarrow$ commute, given $x, y, u \in t\downarrow$ the axioms (NH1) and (NH3)–(NH5) translate to the standard set of axioms of a Heyting algebra, while (NH2) translates to $(x \vee y) \to y = x \to y$, which follows from the axioms of a Heyting algebras.

(ii) Both $t\downarrow$ and $t'\downarrow$ are lattice sections of S. The map φ is an isomorphism of lattices by a result of [9] with an inverse given by $\psi(y) = t \wedge y \wedge t$. Hence φ is also an isomorphism of Heyting algebras. Finally, $x \wedge \varphi(x) \wedge x = x \wedge t \wedge x \wedge t \wedge x = x$ by Lemma 3.2, and likewise $\varphi(x) \wedge x \wedge \varphi(x) = t' \wedge x \wedge t' \wedge x \wedge t' \wedge x \wedge t' = t' \wedge x \wedge t' = \varphi(x)$, which yields $x \,\mathcal{D}\, \varphi(x)$.

(iii) By Leech's first decomposition theorem, $\mathcal{D}$ is a congruence on any skew lattice. In order to prove that $\mathcal{D}$ is a noncommutative Heyting algebra congruence, it remains to prove that it is compatible with $\to$. Assume $x \,\mathcal{D}\, u$ and $y \,\mathcal{D}\, v$. We need to prove that $x \to y \,\mathcal{D}\, u \to v$. By Lemma 3.4, $x \to y$ is an element of the Heyting algebra $(y \vee t \vee y)\downarrow$ and $u \to v$ is an element of the Heyting algebra $(v \vee t \vee v)\downarrow$. We may assume that $y \leq x$, $x \in (y \vee t \vee y)\downarrow$,

$v \leq u$ and $u \in (v \vee t \vee v)\downarrow$ (otherwise we replace x by $y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y$ and u by $v \vee (t \wedge u \wedge t) \vee v$). The map

$$\begin{array}{rccl} \rho : (y \vee t \vee y)\downarrow & \to & (v \vee t \vee v)\downarrow \\ z & \mapsto & (v \vee t \vee v) \wedge z \wedge (v \vee t \vee v) \end{array}$$

is an isomorphism of Heyting algebras by (ii), which we have already proved. We claim that $\rho(y) = v$. Indeed,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \rho(y) & = & (v \vee t \vee v) \wedge y \wedge (v \vee t \vee v) \\ & = & (v \wedge y \wedge v) \vee (t \wedge y \wedge t) \vee (v \wedge y \wedge v) \\ & = & v \wedge y \wedge v = v, \end{array}$$

where we used strong distributivity and the fact that the elements y, v and $t \wedge y \wedge t$ are all $\mathcal{D}$-equivalent. Next we prove that $\rho(x \to y)\, \mathcal{D}\, u \to y$. Denoting $\tau = v \vee t \vee v$, using the fact that u, v, $\rho(x)$ all lie in the Heyting algebra $\tau\downarrow$ and that τ is the top element of $\tau\downarrow$, we obtain:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \rho(x \to y) & = & \rho(x) \to \rho(y) \\ & = & \rho(x) \to v \\ & = & (v \vee (t \wedge \rho(x) \wedge t) \vee v) \to v \text{ (by (NH1))} \\ & = & ((v \vee t \vee v) \wedge (v \vee \rho(x) \vee v) \wedge (v \vee t \vee v)) \to v \text{ (by (2))} \\ & = & (\tau \wedge (v \vee \rho(x) \vee v) \wedge \tau) \to v \\ & = & (v \vee \rho(x) \vee u \vee \rho(x) \vee v) \to v \text{ (since } \varphi(x)\, \mathcal{D}\, x\, \mathcal{D}\, u) \\ & = & (v \to v) \wedge (\rho(x) \to v) \wedge (u \to v) \wedge (\rho(x) \to v) \wedge (v \to v) \text{ (in } \tau\downarrow) \\ & = & (\rho(x) \to v) \wedge (u \to v) \wedge (\rho(x) \to v) \\ & = & \rho(x \to y) \wedge (u \to v) \wedge \rho(x \to y). \end{array}$$

That proves $\rho(x \to y) \preceq u \to v$. Similarly we prove $u \to v \preceq \rho(x \to y)$, and $\rho(x \to y)\, \mathcal{D}\, u \to y$ follows. It follows that $S/\mathcal{D}$ is a Heyting algebra. It is isomorphic to $t\downarrow$ as the maximal lattice image of a skew lattice is always isomorphic to any of its lattice sections. □

Note that given $x, y \in S$, where $(S; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t)$ is a noncommutative Heyting algebra, the element $x \to y$ equals $(y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y) \to y$ where the latter can be seen as the implication computed in the Heyting algebra $(y \vee t \vee y)\downarrow$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let S be a normal skew lattice and let $A > B$ be comparable $\mathcal{D}$-classes in S. Then given any $a \in A$ there exists a unique $b \in B$ s.t. $b \leq a$.*

Proof. Take any $x \in B$ and let $b = a \wedge x \wedge a$. Then $b \wedge a = a \wedge x \wedge a \wedge a = a \wedge x \wedge a = b$ and $a \wedge b = a \wedge a \wedge x \wedge a = a \wedge x \wedge a = b$. Hence $b \leq a$. Assume that $b' \in B$ also satisfies $b' \leq a$. Using the idempotency and the normality we obtain:

$$b = b \wedge b' \wedge b = a \wedge b \wedge b' \wedge b \wedge a = a \wedge b' \wedge b \wedge b' \wedge a = a \wedge b' \wedge a = b'.$$

□

Theorem 3.7. *Let S be a strongly distributive skew lattice with 0 such that $S/\mathcal{D}$ is a Heyting algebra. Then S has a top $\mathcal{D}$-class T. Given an element $t \in T$ define a binary operation $\to_t$ by*

$$x \to_t y = y \vee u \vee y,$$

where u is the single element of the $\mathcal{D}$-class $\mathcal{D}_x \to \mathcal{D}_y$ that lies below t w.r.t. natural partial order. Then $\to_t$ satisfies the axioms (NH1)–(NH5) above. Therefore, $(S; \wedge, \vee, \to_t, 0, t)$ is a noncommutative Heyting algebra.

On the other hand, if $(S; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t)$ is a noncommutative Heyting algebra then $\to = \to_t$.

Proof. Denote by $\varphi : S \to S/\mathcal{D}$ the homomorphism that sends x to its $\mathcal{D}$-class $\mathcal{D}_x$. By the assumption $S/\mathcal{D}$ is a Heyting algebra. Hence $T = \varphi^{-1}(1)$ is a top $\mathcal{D}$-class in S. Let $t \in T$ be fixed. Given $x, y \in S$ Lemma 3.6 yields the existence of a unique $u \in \mathcal{D}_x \to \mathcal{D}_y$ with the property $u \leq t$. We need to verify that the operation $\to_t$ as defined above satisfies (NH1)–(NH5).

(NH1). We have $x \to_t y = y \vee u \vee y$ but also $(y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y) \to_t y = y \vee u \vee y$ since $(y \vee (t \wedge x \wedge t) \vee y) \,\mathcal{D}\, x \vee y$ and $\mathcal{D}_x \to \mathcal{D}_y = (\mathcal{D}_x \vee \mathcal{D}_y) \to \mathcal{D}_y$.

(NH2). $\mathcal{D}_x \to \mathcal{D}_x = T$ and obviously $u = t$ is the element of T that is below t w.r.t the natural partial order. Thus $x \to_t x = x \vee t \vee x$.

(NH3). We compute:

$$(3)\quad x \wedge (x \to_t y) \wedge x = x \wedge (y \vee u \vee y) \wedge x = (x \wedge y \wedge x) \vee (x \wedge u \wedge x) \vee (x \wedge y \wedge x).$$

In the Heyting algebra $S/\mathcal{D}$ we have $\mathcal{D}_x \wedge (\mathcal{D}_x \to \mathcal{D}_y) = \mathcal{D}_x \wedge \mathcal{D}_y$. That implies $x \wedge u \wedge x \,\mathcal{D}\, x \wedge y \wedge x$ in S and thus the expression (3) equals $x \wedge y \wedge x$.

(NH4). $y \wedge (x \to_t y) = y \wedge (y \vee u \vee y)$ which equals y by the absorption. Likewise, $(x \to y) \wedge y = y$.

(NH5). Denote by u, v and w the elements below t w.r.t. the natural partial order that lie in the $\mathcal{D}$-classes $\mathcal{D}_x \to (\mathcal{D}_y \wedge \mathcal{D}_z)$, $\mathcal{D}_x \to \mathcal{D}_y$ and $\mathcal{D}_x \to \mathcal{D}_z$, respectively. Computing in the lattice $t{\downarrow}$ yields $u = v \wedge w$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} x \to_t (t \wedge (y \wedge z) \wedge t) &= (t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t) \vee u \vee (t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t) \\ &= (t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t) \vee (v \wedge w) \vee (t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t) \\ = [(t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t) \vee v \vee (t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t)] &\wedge [(t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t) \vee w \vee (t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t)] \\ &= [(t \wedge y \wedge t) \vee v \vee (t \wedge y \wedge t)] \wedge [(t \wedge z \wedge t) \vee w \vee (t \wedge z \wedge t)] \\ &= (x \to_t (t \wedge y \wedge t)) \wedge (x \to_t (t \wedge z \wedge t)), \end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality follows because both $[(t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t) \vee v \vee (t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t)] \wedge [(t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t) \vee w \vee (t \wedge y \wedge z \wedge t)]$ and $[(t \wedge y \wedge t) \vee v \vee (t \wedge y \wedge t)] \wedge [(t \wedge z \wedge t) \vee w \vee (t \wedge z \wedge t)]$ are elements of the $\mathcal{D}$-class $\mathcal{D}_y \wedge \mathcal{D}_z$ that are below t w.r.t. the natural partial order.

To prove the final assertion we show that given a noncommutative Heyting algebra $(S; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t)$ and $x, y \in S$ the element $x \to y$ equals $y \vee u \vee y$ where $u \in \mathcal{D}_{x \to y}$ s.t. $u \leq t$. We have seen that (NH4) implies $y \leq x \to y$.

Moreover, u equals $t \wedge (x \to y) \wedge t$ by Lemma 3.6. We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} y \vee u \vee y &= y \vee (t \wedge (x \to y) \wedge t) \vee y \\ &= (y \vee t \vee y) \wedge (y \vee (x \to y) \vee y) \wedge (y \vee t \vee y) \\ &= (y \vee t \vee y) \wedge (x \to y) \wedge (y \vee t \vee y) \\ &= x \to y, \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows by Lemma 3.4. □

4. Noncommutative frames

A symmetric skew lattice is said to be *join complete* if all commuting subsets have suprema in the natural partial ordering. If S is a join complete skew lattice then S has a bottom element which is obtained as the join of the empty set. By a result of Leech [10] a join complete skew lattice always has a maximal $\mathcal{D}$-class T.

Proposition 4.1. *Let S be a strongly distributive, join complete skew lattice. Then:*

(i) *S has a bottom 0.*
(ii) *Given any $u \in S$ the set $u{\downarrow} = \{x \in S \mid x \leq u\}$ is a lattice.*
(iii) *Given any t in the top $\mathcal{D}$-class T the lattice $t{\downarrow} = \{x \in S \mid x \leq t\}$ is a lattice section of S.*

Proof. (i) is trivial as 0 is obtained as the join of the empty set.

(ii) This follows from the normality of S which is equivalent to $u{\downarrow}$ being a lattice for any $u \in S$, see [11].

(iii) Given $x \in S$, $t \wedge x \wedge t$ is the element that lies in the intersection of $t{\downarrow}$ and $\mathcal{D}_x$. The commutativity of $t{\downarrow}$ follows from the normality of $\wedge$: $(t \wedge x \wedge t) \wedge (t \wedge y \wedge t) = t \wedge x \wedge y \wedge t = t \wedge y \wedge x \wedge t = (t \wedge y \wedge t) \wedge (t \wedge x \wedge t)$. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let S be a strongly distributive skew lattice and $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$ a commuting subset. Then given any $y \in S$ the sets $\{y \wedge x_i \mid i \in I\}$ and $\{x_i \wedge y \mid i \in I\}$ are commuting subsets.*

Proof. Take $i, j \in I$. Using normality, idempotency of $\wedge$ and $x_i \wedge x_j = x_j \wedge x_i$ we obtain:

$$(y \wedge x_i) \wedge (y \wedge x_j) = y \wedge x_i \wedge x_j = y \wedge x_j \wedge x_i = y \wedge x_j \wedge y \wedge x_i = (y \wedge x_j) \wedge (y \wedge x_i).$$

□

A *noncommutative frame* is a strongly distributive, join complete skew lattice that satisfies the infinite distributive laws:

$$(4) \qquad (\bigvee_i x_i) \wedge y = \bigvee_i (x_i \wedge y) \qquad \text{and} \qquad x \wedge (\bigvee_i y_i) = \bigvee_i (x \wedge y_i)$$

for all $x, y \in S$ and all commuting subsets $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$ and $\{y_i \mid i \in I\}$.

We will use the following technical result in the proof of Theorem 4.5.

Lemma 4.3. *Let S be a join complete strongly distributive skew lattice with a top $\mathcal{D}$-class T, $y \in S$, $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$ a commuting subset of S and $t \in T$ s.t. $x_i \leq t$ for all $i \in I$. Denoting $x = \bigvee x_i$ and $\tau = y \vee x \vee t \vee y \vee x$, the following holds:*

$$(\bigvee_{i \in I}(x_i \wedge \tau)) \wedge y = (\bigvee_{i \in I} x_i) \wedge y.$$

Proof. Using the absorption we obtain $\tau \wedge x = x$, $\tau \wedge x_i = x_i$ and $y \wedge \tau = y$. Moreover, $\tau \wedge x_i \wedge \tau \leq \tau$ for all i, and thus $\bigvee(\tau \wedge x_i \wedge \tau) \leq \tau$. That yields:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (\bigvee_{i \in I}(x_i \wedge \tau)) \wedge y & = & (\bigvee_{i \in I}(\tau \wedge x_i \wedge \tau)) \wedge y \wedge \tau \\ & = & \tau \wedge (\bigvee_{i \in I}(\tau \wedge x_i \wedge \tau)) \wedge y \wedge \tau. \\ & = & \tau \wedge (\bigvee_{i \in I}(x_i \wedge \tau)) \wedge y \wedge \tau. \end{array}$$

We claim that:

$$\tau \wedge (\bigvee_{i \in I}(x_i \wedge \tau)) \wedge y \wedge \tau = \tau \wedge (\bigvee_{i \in I} x_i) \wedge y \wedge \tau. \tag{5}$$

Both sides of (5) lie in the same $\mathcal{D}$-class and they are both below τ w.r.t. the natural partial order. Hence they must be equal by Lemma 3.6.

Finally, the right side of (5) simplifies to

$$(\bigvee_{i \in I} x_i) \wedge y. \tag{6}$$

□

A *noncommutative frame* is a strongly distributive, join complete skew lattice that satisfies the infinite distributive laws:

$$(\bigvee_i x_i) \wedge y = \bigvee_i (x_i \wedge y) \qquad \text{and} \qquad x \wedge (\bigvee_i y_i) = \bigvee_i (x \wedge y_i) \tag{7}$$

for all $x, y \in S$ and all commuting subsets $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$ and $\{y_i \mid i \in I\}$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let S be a strongly distributive skew lattice with 0 such that $S/\mathcal{D}$ is a frame. Then S is a noncommutative frame.*

Proof. Being a frame $S/\mathcal{D}$ must be bounded and thus S has a top $\mathcal{D}$ class T. Let $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a commuting subset. We claim that $\bigvee x_i$ exists in S. Since lattice sections are maximal commuting subsets it follows that there exist $t \in T$ such that $x_i \leq t$ for all $i \in I$. Let x be the single element in the $\mathcal{D}$-class $\bigvee \mathcal{D}_{x_i}$ that satisfies $x \leq t$. Then $x = \bigvee x_i$.

It remains to prove that S satisfies the infinite distributive laws (7). To see this take a commuting subset $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$ and $y \in S$. Since $\{x_i \mid i \in I\}$ is a commuting set it is contained in a lattice section, i.e. there exists $t \in T$ s.t. $x_i \leq t$ for all i. Set $x = \bigvee_{i \in I} x_i$ and $\tau = y \vee x \vee t \vee y \vee x$. Since $\tau\!\downarrow$ is a lattice section it must be isomorphic to $S/\mathcal{D}$ and thus a frame. We obtain $x \leq t$, $\tau \wedge x = x$, $\tau \wedge x_i = x_i$ and $y \wedge \tau = y$. The elements $\tau \wedge x \wedge \tau$, $\tau \wedge y \wedge \tau$ and $\tau \wedge x_i \wedge \tau$ all lie in the frame $\tau\!\downarrow$. Hence:

$$(\bigvee_i (\tau \wedge x_i \wedge \tau)) \wedge (\tau \wedge y \wedge \tau) = \bigvee_i ((\tau \wedge x_i \wedge \tau) \wedge (\tau \wedge y \wedge \tau)) \tag{8}$$

since complete Heyting algebras satisfy the infinite distributive laws. The left side of (8) simplifies to:

$$(\bigvee_i (x_i \wedge \tau)) \wedge (\tau \wedge y)$$

which further simplifies to:

$$(\bigvee_i (x_i \wedge \tau)) \wedge y \tag{9}$$

by Lemma 3.2. By Lemma 4.3 the expression in (9) equals

$$(\bigvee_i x_i) \wedge y.$$

On the other hand, the right side of (8) simplifies to:

$$\bigvee_i (x_i \wedge y).$$

That proves:

$$(\bigvee_i x_i) \wedge y = \bigvee_i (x_i \wedge y).$$

We prove the infinite distributive law

$$x \wedge (\bigvee_i y_i) = \bigvee_i (x \wedge y_i).$$

in a similar way. □

We are now ready to prove that join complete noncommutative Heyting algebras are exactly the noncommutative frames. More precisely:

Theorem 4.5. *Let S be a noncommutative frame and t a distinguished element in the top $\mathcal{D}$-class T of S. Given $a, b \in S$ set:*

$$a \to b = \bigvee_{\{x \in (b \vee t \vee b)\downarrow \mid x \wedge (b \vee (t \wedge a \wedge t) \vee b) \leq b\}} x. \tag{10}$$

Then S is a join complete noncommutative Heyting algebra.

On the other hand, if $(S; \wedge, \vee, \to, 0, t)$ is a join complete noncommutative Heyting algebra then S satisfies (10) *and the infinite distributive laws* (7)*.*

Proof. Let S be a noncommutative frame. A standard result in the theory of Heyting algebras yields that frames are exactly the complete Heyting algebras. Thus the operation $\to$ as defined in the theorem yields a Heyting implication on the quotient $S/\mathcal{D}$ which becomes a Heyting algebra. In order to prove that S is a noncommutative Heyting algebra, by Theorem 3.7 it suffices to show that $\to$ equals $\to_t$. To see this we need to show that $a \to b$ is an element in the $\mathcal{D}$-class $\mathcal{D}_a \to \mathcal{D}_b$ that lies below $b \vee t \vee b$. (Such an element is unique by Lemma 3.6.) The fact that $a \to b \in \mathcal{D}_a \to \mathcal{D}_b$ is clear since the operation $\to$ on $S/\mathcal{D}$ is the usual Heyting implication. We simplify the

notation by writing $\bigvee$ instead of $\bigvee_{\{x\in(b\vee t\vee b)\downarrow \mid x\wedge(b\vee(t\wedge a\wedge t)\vee b)\leq b\}}$. It remains to prove that $\bigvee x \leq b\vee t\vee b$. We have:

$$(\bigvee x)\wedge(b\vee t\vee b)=\bigvee(x\wedge(b\vee t\vee b))=\bigvee x,$$

where we used $x\in(b\vee t\vee b)\downarrow$. Similarly we prove $(b\vee t\vee b)\wedge(\bigvee x)=\bigvee x$, and $\bigvee x\leq b\vee t\vee b$ follows.

Assume now that $(S;\wedge,\vee,\to,0,t)$ is a join complete noncommutative Heyting algebra. By (NH1) $a\to b$ equals $(b\vee(t\wedge a\wedge t)\vee b)\to b$, which can be interpreted as computed in the Heyting algebra $(b\vee t\vee b)\downarrow$. Proceeding with the computation in $(b\vee t\vee b)\downarrow$ we obtain:

$$(b\vee(t\wedge a\wedge t)\vee b)\to b=\bigvee_{\{x\in(b\vee t\vee b)\downarrow \mid x\wedge(b\vee(t\wedge a\wedge t)\vee b)\leq b\}} x.$$

Thus S satisfies (10). S satisfies the infinite distributive law by Theorem 4.4. □

References

[1] A. Bauer, K. Cvetko-Vah, M. Gehrke, S. van Gool and G. Kudryavtseva, A Noncommutative Priestley Duality, *Topology and Appl.* **160** (2013), 1423–1438.

[2] R. J. Bignall, J. E. Leech, Skew Boolean algebras and discriminator varieties, *Algebra Universalis* **33** (1995), 387–398.

[3] A. Connes, C. Consani, The Arithmetic Site, *Comptes Rendus Mathematique Ser. I* **352**, (2014), 971–975.

[4] A. Connes, C. Consani, The Geometry of the Arithmetic Site, *Advances in Mathematics* **291** (2016) 274–329.

[5] K. Cvetko-Vah, On skew Heyting algebras, *Ars Mathematica Contemporanea* **12** (2017), 37–50.

[6] K. Cvetko-Vah, J. Pita Costa, On the coset laws for skew lattices, *Semigroup Forum* **83** (2011), no. 3, 395–411.

[7] L. Le Bruyn, The sieve topology on the arithmetic site, *Journal of algebra and its applications*, **15** 1650020 (2015) [11 pages].

[8] L. Le Bruyn, Covers of the arithmetic site, arXiv/math.RA 1602.01627 (2016).

[9] J. Leech, Skew lattices in rings, *Alg. Universalis* **26** (1989), 48–72.

[10] J. Leech, Skew Boolean Algebras, *Alg. Universalis* **27** (1990), 497–506.

[11] J. Leech, Normal skew lattices, *Semigroup Forum 44* (1992), 1–8.

[12] S. Mac Lane, I. Moerdijk, *Sheaves in geometry and logic. A first introduction to topos theory*, Springer-Verlag (1994).

[13] H. A. Priestley, Representation of distributive lattices by means of ordered stone spaces, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **2** (1970), 186–190.

[14] H.A. Priestley, Ordered topological spaces and the representation of distributive lattices, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **24** (1972), 507–530.

University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Jadranska 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia